

Remarks

Claims 31-40 were pending in the case at the time of the current Office Action. As a result of this amendment claim 31-40 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The response below is made in view of the amended claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 32 and 40 because of informalities as noted, and the claims as amended have taken into account and corrected the noted informalities. It is believed that the objections should be withdrawn accordingly.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 31-34 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodnar et al. With regard to claim 31, the Examiner states that Bodnar describes an apparatus 10, 30 to provide input/output functionality in conjunction with a portable computing device 20. The Examiner states that the apparatus 10, 30 comprises a portable housing having at least one selectable docking port 10 to allow docking of the portable computing device 20 in at least two operable configurations, with reference to FIGS. 1A, 3A, 3B and column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 36. Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing rejection in view of the amended claim 31, and in accordance with the reasons set forth hereafter.

In claim 31, the invention as now defined relates to a portable computing device including a removable communication apparatus provided in conjunction therewith. The apparatus comprises a portable computing device having a housing with at least one selectable docking port associated therewith. A communication apparatus is provided, having at least two selectable docking ports such that the communication apparatus is capable of mechanically docking and interfacing to the portable computing device in at least two operable configurations relative to the portable computing device. With reference to the prior art of Bodnar, there is shown a companion digital organizer designed to interface with a cellular telephone. The present invention on the other hand is directed to a portable computing device including a selectively removable communication apparatus. Thus, the device taught by Bodnar includes a smaller

“companion device” as shown in FIGS. 2A and 2B for example, which interfaces with the cellular telephone as shown in FIGS. 3A and 3B. The companion device as taught by Bodnar is therefore not a communication device as set forth in the presently claimed invention. In accordance with the present invention, the selectively removable communication apparatus provides significant benefits which clearly are not anticipated by Bodnar. The portable computing device in association with a removable communication apparatus as set forth in the present invention provides a user with the enhanced capabilities of the portable computing device in conjunction with the communication apparatus when needed, but also allows the communication apparatus to be selectively removed for use as a communication device alone. Thus, the user is afforded the ability to carry a small communication device if the enhanced capabilities of the portable computing device are not needed for a period of time, thereby providing a convenient and simply used and flexible system for the user. Although the prior art of Bodnar relates to a companion digital organizer, the arrangement taught by Bodnar simply does not afford the functionality or flexibility of use in accordance with the present invention.

Further, the Examiner has stated that Bodnar teaches a system which allows for docking and interfacing between the devices in at least two operable configurations, with specific reference to FIGS. 1A, 3A, 3B and column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 36. As shown in FIG. 1A, there is provided a docking unit 10 and a detachable main unit 20 for use with a phone 30. In this embodiment, the docking unit 10 is detachably mated to a target phone 30 and main unit 20 is docked to the docking unit 10. The phone 30 is therefore separate from the docking unit 10 and main unit 20. The docking unit 10 when mated with phone 30 connects to the communication connector 40 of the phone 30. The main unit 20 in no way connects to the phone 30 itself. Thus, the arrangement taught by Bodnar does not show a portable computing device with which a communication apparatus is selectively docked, but instead teaches an arrangement of a docking unit 10 and main unit 20. Further, with reference to FIGS. 3A and 3B as referred to by the Examiner, these figures relate to an alternative configuration, wherein the companion device 20A is selectively docked with a docking unit 10A, being essentially similar to that shown in FIG. 1. In this embodiment, the docking unit 10A is configured to attach to the host phone 30A in the manner of a cover for an internal battery compartment. This simply does not relate to the present invention, wherein the selectively removable communication apparatus is selectively

docked and interfaced to the portable computing device in at least two operable configurations relative to the portable computing device. As shown in FIGS. 16A and 16B, the communication apparatus is positionable in the alternative configurations of these figures as an example, to provide enhanced functionality in conjunction with the portable computing device with which it is selectively interfaced. The arrangement shown by Bodnar simply does not relate to providing at least two operable configurations relative to the portable computing device according to the present invention. In the embodiments taught by Bodnar, the companion device 20 or 20A is always simply docked with the docking unit 10 or 10A in the same manner, and different operable configurations are not provided therewith.

It is therefore believed that claim 31 as now amended clearly distinguishes from the prior art of Bodnar, which neither anticipates nor makes obvious the invention as now claimed. Favorable action with respect to independent claim 31 is thought to be in order and is hereby respectfully requested.

Regarding those claims dependent upon independent claim 31, also rejected as being anticipated by Bodnar, these claims define further aspects of the invention which are not contemplated in any way by the prior art of Bodnar. As Bodnar teaches a cell phone having a companion digital organizer, nothing therein relates to providing a communication apparatus which is selectively docked to a portable computing device to provide communication capabilities in conjunction with the portable computing device as set forth in claim 32. In claim 33, the communication apparatus is stated to include particular characteristics which are not anticipated by Bodnar. The digital organizer device shown in FIGS. 2A and 2B of Bodnar is not a communication apparatus according to the presently claimed invention according to claim 33. Similarly, the invention as now set forth in claim 34 as amended clearly distinguishes from Bodnar, in that the communication apparatus is defined as including a keypad interface on both sides thereof, each of which are individually accessible when docked to the portable computing device in at least one operable configuration. Nothing within Bodnar relates to such a feature in any manner.

Regarding claim 36, the communication apparatus according to the invention is operational when docked to the portable computing device or when undocked, and data may be exchanged therebetween, which has no correlation within the prior art of Bodnar. In Bodnar, the

companion digital organizer does not exchange data with the cell phone as set forth in claim 36 in accordance with the present invention.

Additionally, with regard to claim 37, the companion digital organizer of Bodnar does not include a first side having a first interface keypad, a display and a first docking connector, and a backside having at least a second docking connector as set forth in this claim. The companion digital organizer is connected in only one fashion to the docking unit 10 or 10A, and the arrangement as specified in claim 37 is clearly not anticipated nor made obvious.

Based upon the foregoing, it is believed that claims 31-34 and 36-37 as now amended, clearly distinguish from the prior art of Bodnar, and favorable action thereon is thought to be in order and is hereby respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Examiner has also rejected claims 35 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Bodnar et al. Regarding claim 35, the Examiner notes that Bodnar does not mention that a cellular phone is docked with a portable computing device in the manner according to this claim. The Examiner goes on to state that since Bodnar suggests that a cellular phone can be docked with a portable computing device using various types of docking connectors, the claimed docking configuration of claim 35 is stated to be merely a design choice.

This rejection is respectfully traversed, in that the invention of claim 35 clearly defines an invention which provides significant functionality over and above that taught by Bodnar. The ability according to the present invention as claimed in 35 provides a portable computing device mated with a communication apparatus wherein the communication apparatus selectively serves as a cover for the display of the portable computing device. This protects the display of the portable computing device from impact or damage, and does not merely represent a design choice, but defines a unique invention which clearly distinguishes from Bodnar.

Similarly, with regard to claim 38, the Examiner notes that Bodnar does not mention that the cellular phone comprises a second keypad for data entry at the backside. The Examiner goes on to state that since a cellular phone having a secondary rear keypad is known in the art (referencing Patent No. 6,714,802, which has not been made a part of the rejection), this aspect of the claimed invention would have been obvious. Such a position has no basis within the prior

art, as Bodnar clearly does not teach or make obvious in any way the aspects of the invention as defined in claim 38. The communication apparatus, which the Examiner has correlated to the companion digital organizer of Bodnar, is a separate component from the cell phone taught by Bodnar, and the Examiner's position that a cell phone having a rear keypad such as shown by U.S. Patent No. 6,714,802, is unfounded. The companion digital organizer of Bodnar does not in any way include a second keypad, nor is the companion digital organizer positionable with respect to the cell phone so as to access a second keypad according to this claimed invention. The companion digital organizer of Bodnar is not dockable with its front or backside facing the portable computing device, and thus such a feature is clearly not made obvious thereby.

With regard to claim 39, as mentioned with respect to claim 31 and claim 38, Bodnar is deficient regarding the ability to interface a communication apparatus with a portable computing device in at least two operable configurations as set forth in the present invention. Claim 39 defines further aspects relating to these features which are clearly not made obvious by Bodnar.

With respect to claim 40, the Examiner notes that Bodnar does not provide positioning of the communication apparatus in association with the portable computing apparatus as set forth in claim 40. Recognizing this deficiency, the Examiner again states that such configurations are merely a design choice, although no teachings within the prior art relates to such adaptable configurations as set forth in claim 40. It is clear that the orientations of the communication apparatus with respect to the portable computing device provides significant advantages in use of the combined system which are clearly not anticipated nor made obvious by Bodnar. The ability to position the communication apparatus in the alternative configurations defined in this claim provide functionality which clearly is not contemplated by Bodnar and clearly not merely a design choice. The mating of the companion digital organizer and cell phone in Bodnar is such that when mated, the companion digital organizer is effectively out of the way and concealed on the back of the cell phone, without any other configurations or positions being taught or made obvious by Bodnar.

Accordingly, it is believed that dependent claims 35 and 38-40 are also clearly in allowable condition over the prior art of Bodnar, and favorable action is thought to be in order and is hereby respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 31-40 as now amended clearly distinguish from the prior art of Bodnar and are in condition for allowance. Prompt consideration of this application and allowance of the claims is requested. If the Examiner should have any questions regarding this application or the amendment, a call to Applicant's representative would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott M. Oldham/

Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712

Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP
One GOJO Plaza
Suite 300
Akron, OH 44311-1076
(330) 864-5550
Fax: 330-864-7986
smoldham@hahnlaw.com